



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/934,549

08/23/2001

Lin Cheng

TS01-285

9167

54657 7590 05/02/2008

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
IP DEPARTMENT (TSMC)  
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

EXAMINER

TRAN, HANH VAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3637

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/02/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/934,549	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHENG, LIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> HANH V. TRAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/27/2007 has been entered.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 1/30/2008 is acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1, 3 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,524,057 to Park in view of USP 6,454,512 to Weiss, USP 5749589 to

Hopkins et al, Germany 3917874 to Seibert, USP 4,293,075 to Veralrud, USP 6,421,113 to Armentrout, and USP 5,873,585 to Engelking.

Park discloses a component transport cart comprising, such as shown in Fig 4, a lower portion comprising wheels 105, a platform 110 having a first and a second surface opposite said first surface (with the second surface being defined as the surface having a control knob 190 rested thereon), said wheels 105 attached to said first surface of said platform, a plurality of corner portions being mounted on the second surface of the platform, an upper portion 150 disposed over said corner portions, with said corner portions forming an interface between said platform and said upper portion 150, said upper portion comprising a front surface, a back surface a planar bottom surface being orthogonal to said front and back surfaces, a top surface being parallel with said bottom surface, a left surface being located in a plane orthogonal to said planar bottom surface, a right surface being parallel with said left surface, an upper portion divider 155 provided in a plane parallel with said left and right surfaces, components box support units being mounted in a box support plane and capable of supporting a component box, adjacent rows of components box support units being separated by a distance, said component box support units extending from said front surface of the component cart to said back surface and arranged along said left and right surfaces, a handle attached to said support portion enabling motion of said component cart, wherein said component cart formed of anti-Electro Static Discharge materials. The differences being that Park fails to disclose shock absorbers being mounted on the second surface of the platform (instead of the corner portions), a plurality of upper portion dividers provided

therein, component support units being arranged along the upper portion dividers, cushioning units arranged over the surface of the component box support units, a set of sliding doors mounted in a plane of the front surface, the box support plane angled with respect to the planar bottom surface and downwardly from the front surface, and the sliding doors are formed of anti-Electro Static Discharge materials.

Weiss teaches the idea of having shock absorbers 32 being mounted on the second surface of a platform in order to prevent damage to the wafers due to jolting of the cart during transporting of the wafers. Hopkins et al further teaches the idea of providing shock absorbers 76 being disposed between a platform 35 and an upper portion 21, such as shown in Fig 4, in order to absorb vibration between the platform 35 and the upper portion 21. Seibert teaches the idea of providing a transport cart with upper portion dividers therein to provide multiple compartments in order to increase the number of component support units therein, wherein a plurality of component support units being arranged along the upper portion dividers and extending from the front surface to the back surface of the component cart. Veralrud teaches the idea of having the component support units in a storage housing being slanted in a downward direction with respect to a plane of the horizontal bottom panel in order to prevent components placed on the support units from falling out. Armentrout teaches the idea of providing cushioning units over the surface of the component box support units in order to avoid damage to the articles when inserting or removing from the upper portion. Engelking teaches the idea of providing a transport cart with sliding doors 110 in order to allow access to contents of the housing without having to pivot the door. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 3637

have been obvious to modify the structure of Park by providing the component cart with shock absorbers (in place of the corner portions) being mounted on the second surface of the platform in order to prevent damage to the articles placed therein due to jolting of the cart during transporting of the articles, as taught by Weiss, providing shock absorbers being disposed between the platform and the upper portion in order to absorb vibration between the platform and the upper portion, as taught by Hopkins et al, providing the transport cart with upper portion dividers therein to provide multiple compartments in order to increase the number of component support units therein, wherein a plurality of component support units being arranged along the upper portion dividers and extending from the front surface to the back surface of the component cart, as taught by Seibert, having the component support units being slanted in a downward direction with respect to a plane of the planar bottom surface from the front surface in order to prevent articles placed on the support units from falling out, as taught by Veralrud, providing cushioning units over the surface of the component box support units in order to avoid damage to the articles when inserting or removing from the upper portion, as taught by Armentrout, and providing sliding doors in order to allow access to contents of the housing without having to pivot the door, as taught by Engelking, since each of the references teach alternate conventional component housing structure, used for the same intended purpose of housing components therein, thereby providing structure as claimed.

6. Claims 2 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USP 4,999,671 to Iizuka.

Park, as modified, discloses all the elements as discussed above except for the component cart further comprising a plurality of reticle boxes, each with a reticle therein, said reticle boxes laterally disposed and each supported by a corresponding component box support unit.

Iizuka shows that a reticle transport cart is well known in the art in order to facilitate transporting reticles from one location to another, wherein the reticle transport cart comprises a plurality of component support units provided therein to support component boxes, wherein said component boxes being a plurality of reticle boxes, each with a reticle therein. Therefore, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one ordinary skill in the art to modify Park by using it as a reticle transport cart in order to facilitate transporting reticles from one location to another, wherein the reticle transport cart comprises a plurality of component support units provided therein to support component boxes, wherein said component boxes being a plurality of reticle boxes, each with a reticle therein, as taught by Iizuka, such that said reticle boxes laterally disposed and each supported by a corresponding component box support unit, since both teach alternate conventional component cart structure, used for the same intended purpose transporting articles from one location to another, thereby providing structure as claimed.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. In response to applicant's argument that the dampening pad 76 of Hopkins disposed on an angle bracket 79, not an opposed surface of the platform which has the wheels attached thereto, the examiner respectfully takes the position that the claimed language fails to adequately recite the platform in order to distinguish from the prior art of record, and that the angle bracket 79 is a part of the platform, thus meets the claimed limitations of the wheels and shock absorbers being attached to opposed surfaces of a platform.

9. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references can be found in the above art rejection having the triggered clause "in order to...".

10. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection



does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HANH V. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HVT  
April 28, 2008

/Hanh V. Tran/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3637